

Ser. No. 10/017,469

REMARKS

Applicant graciously appreciates the Office's attention to the instant application. In a telephonic interview on June 13, 2005, Applicant discussed the claims and the Gudjonsson reference (Gudjonsson et al., US Pat. No. 6,564,261) with the Examiner. For purposes of clarity, various independent claims are currently amended to indicate that the user in the first and second networks of the heterogeneous network is the same user. This was inferred in the original claims, however, the Examiner suggested explicitly reciting that the user is the same user in the first and second networks of the heterogeneous network. Applicant notes that claims 13 and 41 recite only a single user, i.e., a user in a second network, as such, claims 13 and 41 remain as originally presented. Again, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time and effort with respect to this particular issue.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims of the instant application. This response is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the February 11, 2005 Office Action. Claims 1, 8, 9, 24, 26, 37, 39 and 43 are currently amended. Claims 1-44 are pending.

**Brief Summary of Various Subject Matter of the Instant Application**

The instant application pertains to heterogeneous networks. A particular example considers a scenario where a user may have more than one user name in such heterogeneous networks. For example, a user may have a user name for a network that relies on a WINDOWS® OS and a different user name for a network that relies on a UNIX OS. Table 1 at page 20 of the instant application gives two

Ser. No. 10/017,469

examples: a user with a user name JohnDoe for a WINDOWS® OS network and a user name Johnd for a UNIX OS network and a user with a user name Maryjane for a WINDOWS® OS network and Maryj for a UNIX OS network. This is just one issue that may arise in a heterogeneous network. As discussed below, the Gundjonsson reference does not address this issue or various other issues associated with a user in a heterogeneous network.

Objection to Title

In the Office Action dated February 11, 2005, the objected to the title as not descriptive and requested a new title that is "clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed". Applicant hereby proposes amendment of the title to read "User Name Mapping for a User in a Heterogeneous Network". Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of the Office as to the sufficiency of the proposed title. In the instance that the Office finds the proposed title sufficient, Applicant requests entry of such amendment to the title.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e): Gundjonsson et al.

In the Office Action dated February 11, 2005, the Office rejected claims 1-44 as being anticipated by Gudjonsson et al., US Pat. No. 6,564,261, referred to herein as the Gudjonsson reference.

As set forth in §2131 of the MPEP: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki  
2 Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

3 The Gudjonsson reference pertains to establishing sessions between  
4 anonymous users over various networks (see, e.g., title). The Gudjonsson  
5 reference discloses a user mapping function, "UMF". The UMF "[m]aps a given  
6 local user to a specific US [user server]" and "[m]aps a user at another cluster to a  
7 specific ICS [intra-cluster server] through the CID [cluster ID] associated with the  
8 user" (see Table 1, col. 15). According to the Gudjonsson reference, a user ID  
9 and a CID may be as follows: "joe@net.com", where "joe" is the user ID and the  
10 part after the @ sign is the CID (see, col. 16, lines 44-45). Further, per the  
11 Gudjonsson reference, "[w]ith regard to user identification and mapping, each user  
12 is given a user ID (a UID), which is applicable throughout the whole of the  
13 application" (col. 16, lines 7-8). Thus, in the Gudjonsson reference, it appears that  
14 a user has a UID that may be a user name and that this UID is uniform throughout  
15 the Gudjonsson system.

16 With respect to the UMF, at col. 21, line 61 to col. 22, line 2, the  
17 Gudjonsson reference states:

18 The user mapping function (UMF) 25 itself is preferably stored in the  
19 database, but the code which handles keeping the function correct is  
20 implemented on each server 3 (19, 21, 23) based on the framework. In  
21 clusters 1 which are connected to other clusters, there are preferably two  
22 UMFs: the internal UMF and the external UMF. The internal UMF is used  
23 by CSs and USs to locate USs and ICSs, and by ICSs to locate USs for  
24 local cluster UIDs. The external UMF is used by ICSs to locate ICSs for  
25 external UIDs.

26 Thus, the Gudjonsson reference's UMF pertains to inter-server  
27 communication links for sessions between users.

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1      *Claim 1, 4-8, 11 and 12*

2      Claim 1, as currently amended, recites:

3      *A method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:*  
4            *receiving on a computer in a first network a user name associated*  
5            *with a user in the first network;*  
6            *mapping the user name to a user name associated with the same*  
7            *user in a second network; and*  
8            *mapping the user name associated with the user in the second*  
9            *network to a user identification number associated with the user in the second*  
10          *network.*

11        Applicant currently amends claim 1 for purposes of clarity to explicitly  
12        recite that the user in the second network is the same user as in the first network.  
13        Applicant respectfully submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose,  
14        either expressly or inherently, every element of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, for a  
15        particular user: a user name in a first network, a user name in a second network  
16        and a user identification number. Applicant fails to find such elements in the  
17        Gudjonsson reference. Further, the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose the  
18        mapping of the user name to a user name associated with the same user in a  
19        second network and it does not disclose the mapping the user name associated  
20        with the user to a user identification number associated with the user in the second  
21        network.

22        As already mentioned, the Gudjonsson reference discloses a user mapping  
23        function that “[m]aps a given local user to a specific US [user server]” and  
24        “[m]aps a user at another cluster to a specific ICS [intra-cluster server] through the

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 CJD [cluster ID] associated with the user" (see Table 1, col. 15). Applicant asserts  
2 that such mapping cannot substitute for the mappings of claim 1.

3 Figs. 1-4 and 6 of the Gudjonsson reference depict such users, each labeled  
4 "7". For example, Fig. 3 shows two users, each labeled 7, between which a  
5 communication session is established. As such, Applicant submits that the UMF  
6 of the Gudjonsson pertains primarily to communication sessions between users;  
7 whereas, the subject matter of claim 1 pertains to mapping a user in a  
8 heterogeneous network.

9 For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection of  
10 claim 1 is traversed and that claim 1 is patentable over the Gudjonsson reference.  
11 Claims 4-8 depend on claim 1 and are believed patentable over the Gudjonsson  
12 reference for at least the same reasons. Claims 11 and 12 recite a computer-  
13 readable media for with instructions to perform the method of claim 1 and are  
14 believed patentable over the Gudjonsson reference for at least the same reason as  
15 claim 1.

16

17 *Claim 2*

18 Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and further recites: *accessing resources on a*  
19 *computer in the second network using the user identification number.* Applicant  
20 submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose the subject matter of  
21 claim 2.

22 In rejecting claim 2, the Office refers to col. 11, lines 5-64 of the  
23 Gudjonsson reference, which discloses a way to control access of users 7 to  
24 resources. At col. 11, lines 32-42, the Gudjonsson reference states:

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 From a user 7's perspective, a client 11 appears to the user as a small  
2 inconspicuous application, which in closed form on a user's PC appears as a  
3 small ball on the desktop. As shown in FIG. 7, when the user 7 launches the  
4 application, he/she is prompted for his user identity, which includes the  
5 address to his operator, and a password to be securely authenticated. At this  
6 point, the client 11 connects to the corresponding server 3 and establishes a  
7 secure connection with it. The connection is both strongly authenticated  
8 and may well be encrypted, using known state-of-the-art cryptographic  
9 technology, and can thus not be cracked by mischievous parties.

10 Thus, the Gudjonsson reference discloses entry of a "user identity" by a  
11 user using a PC client 11 for purposes of authenticating a session with a server 3  
12 for use of resources of the server 3. However, to access such resources, Applicant  
13 fails to find any disclosure of the mappings as recited by claim 2, as claim 2  
14 depends on claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection  
15 of claim 2 is traversed and that claim 2 is patentable over the Gudjonsson  
16 reference.

17 In an effort to further distinguish the Gudjonsson reference from the  
18 claimed subject matter, Applicant directs the Office to col. 27, line 5 of the  
19 Gudjonsson reference, which discloses a user log on procedure that includes  
20 authentication:

21 Referring to FIG. 19, in order to access the system/network of this  
22 invention, a user 7 must first log on. FIG. 19 illustrates an example of the  
23 message sequence when a user  $U_1$  logs onto the system. When the CS 21  
24 receives the authentication request it first checks the password for validity.  
25 The user may have been unregistered, etc. Then authentication is  
performed. In the example, the user's UID hasn't been used before.

26 The CS must therefore ask the UMF for USID. The UMF 25 selects an  
27 available US 19 with the least load to be responsible for that UID. The CS  
28 now sets the online status for  $U_1$  on the responsible US 19 and retrieves the  
29 contact list. In the example  $U_1$  has one contact, namely  $B_1$ . The status for  
30 that contact must be fetched from the corresponding US of that contact.  
31 After that, CS subscribes to  $B_1$ 's online status. The US 19 of the contact  
32 user  $B_1$  only replies if  $B_1$  is online. CSs and clients assume by default that a  
33 contact is off-line until they receive a status message.

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1       Applicant submits that this procedure does not disclose the mappings of  
2       claim 2, as it depends on claim 1. Applicant further submits that this segment of  
3       the Gudjonsson reference discloses the purpose of the "user mapping function",  
4       i.e., to identify a user server and to select a user server. This purpose differs from  
5       that of claim 2, which is basically to map a user in a heterogeneous network.

6

7 *Claim 3*

8       Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and further recites: *authenticating the user*  
9       *after the mappings*. Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not  
10      disclose the subject matter of claim 3.

11      In rejecting claim 3, the Office refers to col. 11, lines 5-64 of the  
12      Gudjonsson reference, which discloses a way to for users 7 to authenticate a  
13      session between a client 11 and a server 3. At col. 11, lines 32-42, the Gudjonsson  
14      reference states:

15      From a user 7's perspective, a client 11 appears to the user as a small  
16      inconspicuous application, which in closed form on a user's PC appears as a  
17      small ball on the desktop. As shown in FIG. 7, when the user 7 launches the  
18      application, he/she is prompted for his user identity, which includes the  
19      address to his operator, and a password to be securely authenticated. At this  
20      point, the client 11 connects to the corresponding server 3 and establishes a  
21      secure connection with it. The connection is both strongly authenticated  
22      and may well as encrypted, using known state-of-the-art cryptographic  
23      technology, and can thus not be cracked by mischievous parties.

24      Thus, the Gudjonsson reference discloses entry of a "user identity" by a  
25      user using a PC client 11 for purposes of authenticating a session with a server 3.  
26      However, in authenticating the session, Applicant fails to find any disclosure of  
27      the mappings as recited by claim 3, as claim 3 depends on claim 1. For at least  
28      this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 3 is traversed and that  
29      claim 3 is patentable over the Gudjonsson reference.

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 *Claims 9 and 10*

2 Claim 9 depends on claim 1 and, as currently amended, further recites:  
3 *wherein at least one of the mappings includes using remote procedure calls.*  
4 Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose the subject  
5 matter of claim 9.

6 For purposes of clarifying the subject matter of claims 9 and 10, Applicant  
7 refers to the instant application with respect to remote procedure calls (RPCs). For  
8 example at page 37, lines 7-12 the instant application states:

9 Various user information management service features discussed herein use  
10 remote procedure calls (RPCs). In general, a RPC is a protocol that a  
11 program can use to request a service from another program located in  
12 another computer in a network without having to understand network  
13 details. RPC typically uses a client/server model wherein a requesting  
14 program is a client and a service-providing program is a server.

15 The Office states that the Gudjonsson reference discloses remote procedure  
16 calls for getting credentials, authenticating using credentials, checking map status  
17 and dumping maps at Fig. 11, col. 15, lines 13-64, col. 16, lines 7-67 and col. 18,  
18 lines 15-67. However, Applicant fails to find explicit disclosure of such remote  
19 procedure calls. Further, claim 9 recites "wherein the mappings include using  
20 remote procedure calls". Applicant fails to find any mapping in the Gudjonsson  
21 reference that relies on remote procedure calls. For at least this reason, Applicant  
22 submits that the rejection of claim 9 is traversed and that claim 9 is patentable over  
23 the Gudjonsson reference. Further, claim 10 depends on claim 9 and is believed  
24 patentable for at least the same reason.

25 *Claim 13, 17-20, 24 and 25*

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1       Claim 13 recites:

2       *A method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:*  
3           *receiving on a computer in a first network a user name and a*  
4           *password associated with a user in a second network;*  
5           *authenticating the user using the user name and the password to*  
6           *produce an authenticated user; and*  
7           *mapping the authenticated user to a user identification number*  
8           *associated with the user in a second network.*

9       Applicant respectfully submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not  
10      disclose, either expressly or inherently, every element of claim 13. Claim 13  
11      recites receiving, in a first network, a user name and a password for a user in a  
12      second network for purposes of authenticating the user and mapping the  
13      authenticated user to a user identification number. Applicant fails to find such  
14      elements in the Gudjonsson reference.

15      Applicant respectfully directs the Office to the foregoing summary of the  
16      Gudjonsson reference as well as the evidence and arguments presented with  
17      respect to claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of  
18      claim 13 is traversed and that claim 13 is patentable over the Gudjonsson  
19      reference. Claims 17-20 depend on claim 13 and are believed patentable over the  
20      Gudjonsson reference for at least the same reason. Claims 24 and 25 recite a  
21      computer-readable media for with instructions to perform the method of claim 13  
22      and are believed patentable over the Gudjonsson reference for at least the same  
23      reason as claim 13. Applicant notes that claim 24 is currently amended to pertain  
24      to the subject matter of claim 13.

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 *Claim 14*

2 Claim 14 depends on claim 13 and recites: *further comprising accessing*  
3 *resources on a computer in the second network using the user identification*  
4 *number.* Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose the  
5 subject matter of claim 14.

6 In rejecting claim 14, the Office refers to the rejection of claim 2; thus,  
7 Applicant refers the Office to the foregoing evidence and arguments for claim 2.  
8 Applicant further submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose  
9 receiving a user name and a password on a computer in a first network and  
10 subsequent authenticating to produce an authenticated user and mapping of the  
11 authenticated user to a user identification number for purposes of accessing  
12 resources on a computer in a second network. For at least this reason, Applicant  
13 submits that the rejection of claim 14 is traversed and that claim 14 is patentable  
14 over the Gudjonsson reference.

15  
16 *Claim 15*

17 Claim 15 depends on claim 13 and recites: *wherein a computer in the first*  
18 *network performs the authenticating.* Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson  
19 reference does not disclose the subject matter of claim 15.

20 Applicant fails to find in the Gudjonsson reference the recited  
21 authenticating on a computer in a first network for purposes of producing an  
22 authenticated user and mapping the authenticated user to a user identification  
23 number for the user in a second network. Again, the Gudjonsson reference  
24 pertains primarily to establishing communication sessions between users and  
25 where access to resources is disclosed, there is no disclosure of the claimed

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 authenticating and mapping. Further, Applicant fails to find where the  
2 Gudjonsson reference provides for mapping an authenticated user to a user  
3 identification number. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the  
4 rejection of claim 15 is traversed and that claim 15 is patentable over the  
5 Gudjonsson reference.

6  
7 *Claim 16*

8 Claim 16 depends on claim 13 and recites: *wherein a computer in the first*  
9 *network performs the mapping.* Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson reference  
10 does not disclose the subject matter of claim 16.

11 Applicant fails to find in the Gudjonsson reference the recited  
12 authenticating on a computer in a first network for purposes of producing an  
13 authenticated user and mapping the authenticated user to a user identification  
14 number for the user in a second network. Again, the Gudjonsson reference  
15 pertains primarily to establishing communication sessions between users and  
16 where access to resources is disclosed, there is no disclosure of the claimed  
17 authenticating and mapping. Further, Applicant fails to find where the  
18 Gudjonsson reference provides for mapping an authenticated user to a user  
19 identification number. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the  
20 rejection of claim 16 is traversed and that claim 16 is patentable over the  
21 Gudjonsson reference.

22  
23 *Claim 21*  
24  
25

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1           Claim 21 depends on claim 13 and recites: *wherein the mapping includes*  
2           *using a map on a mapping server.* Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson  
3           reference does not disclose the subject matter of claim 21.

4           Applicant fails to find in the Gudjonsson reference the recited mapping.  
5           Again, the Gudjonsson reference pertains primarily to establishing communication  
6           sessions between users and where access to resources is disclosed, there is no  
7           disclosure of the claimed mapping. In particular, Applicant fails to find where the  
8           Gudjonsson reference provides for mapping an authenticated user to a user  
9           identification number. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the  
10           rejection of claim 21 is traversed and that claim 21 is patentable over the  
11           Gudjonsson reference.

12

13 *Claims 22-23*

14           Claim 22 depends on claim 13 and recites: *wherein the mapping includes*  
15           *using remote procedure calls.* Applicant respectfully directs the Office to the  
16           evidence and arguments for claims 9 and 10, above. For at least this reason,  
17           Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 22 is traversed and that claim 22 is  
18           patentable over the Gudjonsson reference. Further, claim 23 depends on claim 22  
19           and is believed patentable for at least the same reason.

20

21 *Claims 26-34, 37 and 38*

22           Claim 26, as currently amended, recites:

23           *A method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:*  
24           *receiving on a computer in a second network a user identification*  
25           *number associated with a user in a first network; and*

Ser. No. 10/017,469

mapping the user identification number to a user name associated with the same user in the second network wherein the user's user identification number optionally maps to more than one user name for the user in the heterogeneous network.

Applicant currently amends claim 26 for purposes of clarity to explicitly recite that the user in the second network is the same user as in the first network. Applicant respectfully submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, every element of claim 26. Claim 26 recites mapping the user identification number to a user name associated with the same user in the second network. Further, for purposes of clarity, Applicant currently amends claim 26 to recite that the user in the first and second networks of the heterogeneous network is the same user and that the user's user identification number optionally maps to more than one user name for the user in the heterogeneous network. Applicant fails to find such mapping in the Gudjonsson reference.

At the abstract, Figs. 1 and 6, col. 11, lines 21 to col. 12, line 54 and col. 30, line 61 to col. 31, line 58 of the Gudjonsson reference, Applicant fails to find evidence relevant to the subject matter of claim 26. In an effort to clearly distinguish the Gudjonsson reference, Applicant respectfully refers the Office to col. 24, lines 32-47:

FIG. 14 is a flowchart illustrating how a first user (e.g., user #1) can establish a communications session (e.g., voice chat, text chat, etc.) with a second user (e.g., user #2) using one or more clusters of the network. The first and second users may be assigned to the same cluster or alternatively to different clusters of the network. Moreover, the first and second users may be assigned to the same user server (US) 19, but more likely are assigned to different user servers 19. To start, the first user desires to send the second user an invitation message regarding the session (i.e., an INVITE message) [step 151]. The first user may look up the second user's

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1                   UID on the first user's contact list (note that the UID need not include a  
2 network address of the second user such as the second user's phone number  
3 of IP address, thereby keeping a degree of anonymity associated with the  
4 communication session).

5                   Applicant submits that the Gudjonsson reference discloses a first user  
6 looking up a second user's UID on the first user's contact list. As already  
7 mentioned, according to the Gudjonsson reference, "[w]ith regard to user  
8 identification and mapping, each user 7 is given a user ID (a UID), which is  
9 applicable throughout the whole of the application" (col. 16, lines 7-8). There is  
10 no disclosure of mapping a user identification number in a heterogeneous network  
11 to a user name where a user may have a different user name in various of the  
12 networks of the heterogeneous network. Such different user names typically exist  
13 in a heterogeneous network with a WINDOWS® OS network and a UNIX OS  
14 network. Table 1 at page 20 of the instant application gives two examples: a user  
15 with a user name JohnDoe for a WINDOWS® OS network and a user name Johnd  
16 for a UNIX OS network and a user with a user name Maryjane for a WINDOWS®  
17 OS network and Maryj for a UNIX OS network. As discussed below, the  
18 Gudjonsson reference does not address such issues as associated with users in  
19 heterogeneous networks.

20                   For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 26, as currently  
21 amended, is patentable over the Gudjonsson reference. Claims 27-34 depend on  
22 claim 26 and are believed patentable over the Gudjonsson reference for at least the  
23 same reason. Claims 37 and 38 recite a computer-readable media for with  
24 instructions to perform the method of claim 26 and are believed patentable over  
25 the Gudjonsson reference for at least the same reason as claim 26. Applicant notes  
that claim 37 is currently amended to pertain to the subject matter of claim 26.

Ser. No. 10/017,469

**Claims 35-36**

Claim 35 depends on claim 26 and recites: *wherein the mapping includes using remote procedure calls.* Applicant respectfully directs the Office to the evidence and arguments for claims 9 and 10, above. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 35 is traversed and that claim 35 is patentable over the Gudjonsson reference. Further, claim 36 depends on claim 35 and is believed patentable for at least the same reason.

**Claims 39 and 40**

Claim 39, as currently amended, recites:

*A method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:*  
*receiving on a computer in a first network a user name associated with a user in the first network;*  
*mapping the user name to a user name associated with the same user in a second network; and*  
*mapping the user name associated with the user in the second network to a user identification number associated with the user in the second network, wherein the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override.*

Applicant currently amends claim 39 for purposes of clarity to explicitly recite that the user in the second network is the same user as in the first network. Applicant respectfully submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, every element of claim 39. The instant application

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 discusses default, simple and explicit maps and override. At page 30, lines 4-10,  
2 the instant application states:

3 Such an advanced mapping feature is useful to override an inadvertently  
4 created mapping, for example, one created due to simple mappings. This  
5 feature avoids associating different users who may be given the identical  
6 user names in two networks (e.g., WINDOWS® OS and UNIX® OS  
networks), which would be likely to cause a simple mapping to  
"incorrectly" map such users. Similarly, mapping a user to an unmapped  
user is also useful to ensure that some users are provided anonymous  
network file system access privileges.

7 At page 31, lines 9-12, the instant application states:

8 If a client's user information is explicitly associated with an "unmapped"  
9 user, the exemplary user name mapping returns an indication that the user is  
10 "unmapped". This feature is useful to override users who get mapped by  
default due and/or to assign an anonymous UID and/or GID.

11 Applicant fails to find in the Gudjonsson reference disclosure of  
12 mechanisms for override. At the abstract, Fig. 6, col. 11, lines 21 to col. 12, line  
13 54 and col. 18, lines 15-67 of the Gudjonsson reference, Applicant fails to find any  
14 evidence relevant to the subject matter of claim 39.

15 Applicant also directs the Office to evidence and arguments presented with  
16 respect to claim 1 to traverse the rejection of claim 39. For at least these reasons,  
17 Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 39 is traversed and that claim 39 is  
18 patentable over the Gudjonsson reference. Claim 40 depends on claim 39 and is  
19 believed patentable over the Gudjonsson reference for at least the same reasons.

20  
21 *Claims 41 and 42*

22 Claim 41 recites:

23 *A method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:*  
24 *receiving on a computer in a first network a user name and a*  
25 *password associated with a user in a second network;*

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1                   authenticating the user using the user name and the password to  
2 produce an authenticated user; and

3                   mapping the authenticated user to a user identification number  
4 associated with the user in a second network wherein the mapping includes using  
5 a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a  
6 simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override.

7                   Applicant respectfully submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not  
8 disclose, either expressly or inherently, every element of claim 41. Applicant  
9 directs the Office to the evidence and arguments for claim 39 for override and  
10 claim 13 for various other elements. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits  
11 that the rejection of claim 41 is traversed and that claim 41 is patentable over the  
12 Gudjonsson reference. Claim 42 depends on claim 41 and is believed patentable  
13 over the Gudjonsson reference for at least the same reasons.

14  
15 *Claims 43 and 44*

16                   Claim 43, as currently amended, recites:

17                   *A method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:*  
18                   *receiving on a computer in a second network a user identification*  
19                   *number associated with a user in a first network; and*

20                   *mapping the user identification number to a user name associated*  
21                   *with the same user in the second network wherein the mapping includes using a*  
22                   *map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a*  
23                   *simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override.*

24                   Applicant currently amends claim 43 for purposes of clarity to explicitly  
25 recite that the user in the second network is the same user as in the first network.

Ser. No. 10/017,469

1 Applicant respectfully submits that the Gudjonsson reference does not disclose,  
2 either expressly or inherently, every element of claim 43. Applicant directs the  
3 Office to the evidence and arguments for claim 39 for override and claim 26 for  
4 various other elements. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the  
5 rejection of claim 43 is traversed and that claim 43 is patentable over the  
6 Gudjonsson reference. Claim 44 depends on claim 43 and is believed patentable  
7 over the Gudjonsson reference for at least the same reasons.

8

9 **Conclusion**

10 Pending claims 1-44 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant  
11 respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application.  
12 If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to  
13 contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

14

15 Respectfully Submitted,

16

17 Dated: 6-13-05

18 By: 

19 Brian Pangrle  
20 Reg. No. 42,973  
21 Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
22 (509) 324-9256  
23  
24  
25